

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1 and 8-11 stand rejected as anticipated by Mano (4,926,490). Mano is understood to disclose a method for recognizing characters on a document, even if the document is skewed on a scanner. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Mano is believed to be deficient on a number of grounds. For example, the reference does not appear to concern documents bearing an indicia that is “*machine readable but not generally intelligible to a human viewer thereof*” as required by the rejected claims. Instead, Mano concerns recognizing alphanumeric characters (D, C, B, A, etc.) that are printed on a page and scanned at a skewed orientation.

Nor does Mano appear to teach an arrangement in which “*the document image data can thereafter be accessed from the data store by use of said binary identification data*” (i.e., binary data represented by the machine-readable-but-not-human-intelligible-indicia).

Given these and other shortcomings, Mano is not believed to anticipate claim 1.

It is not seen that col. 4, lines 20-35 provides any teaching of a machine readable/generally-unintelligible-to-humans indicia that represents 20-64 bits of binary information, as required by claim 8.

Nor is column 2, lines 35-40 understood to teach a steganographic watermark, as required by claim 9.

No reference to ink jet printing (claim 10) can be found at column 5, columns 1-35.

All of the other claims stand rejected as obvious over Mano in combination with other references. Given Mano’s failure to teach the elements cited above, the obviousness rejections premised on Mano are believed to be similarly deficient.

The obviousness rejections also suffer from lack of cognizable motivations to modify and combine the references in the manners asserted.

For example, the rejection of claim 12 states “*the use and advantages of the paper sheet having adhesive on the other side is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art as evidenced by Cran.*” (This is understood to be Crandall, 5,782,494.) However, the recitation that something (e.g., adhesive notes) is well known still begs the question of

why an artisan would have been motivated to modify Mano's teachings in the manner asserted to incorporate the adhesive note teachings of Cran.

The Action continues "*Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate using an adhesive paper sheet in Mano's method in order for construction to pass through a personal computer printer without damage to the printer.*"

Again, this falls short of the requisite rationale. Mano – it will be recalled – concerns document *scanning*, not printing. What does Cran have to do with document scanning? And what teaching or suggestion in Cran, Mano, or elsewhere in the art, would have sent an artisan looking for Cran's teachings concerning feeding adhesive notes through printers to apply to Mano's problem of recognizing skewed text? Etc.

As to independent 18, a paragraph at the bottom of page 7 quoted language from the claim, but no explanation was offered as to how the art relates to this claim.

In view of such failings, none of these other Section 103 rejections is believed to have established the requisite *prima facie* showing of obviousness. As such, they are not particularly addressed in this response.

Favorable reconsideration is solicited.

Date: December 16, 2003

**CUSTOMER NUMBER 23735**

Phone: 503-885-9699

FAX 503-885-9880

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William Y. Conwell  
Registration No. 31,943